DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 141 EA 010 641

AUTHOR Fitzgerald, John; Gershman, Janis
TITLE Managerial Attitudes Towards Part-Time Employment: A Study of Supervisory Personnel at the Toronto Board of Education. No. 146.
INSTITUTION Toronto Board of Education (Ontario). Research Dept.
PUB DATE Sep 77
NOTE 23p.
AVAILABLE FROM Toronto Board of Education, 155 College Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5T 1P6 ($2.00 for first copy, $1.00 for each additional copy)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Employer Attitudes; Foreign Countries; *Part Time Jobs; Questionnaires
IDENTIFIERS Canada; Toronto Board of Education

ABSTRACT

Those supervisory personnel at the Toronto Board of Education responding to a questionnaire on part-time employment (94 respondents out of 176 supervisors, or 53.4 percent) do not generally believe that more part-time jobs can or should be created in their departments. Employment of staff on a part-time basis is regarded by the respondents as more likely to be disadvantageous than beneficial, with the operating efficiency of the board most likely to suffer. Perceived benefits and disadvantages of part-time employment are discussed, and the original questionnaire is appended.
(Author/PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Toronto Board of Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED157141

EA 010 641

RESEARCH SERVICE

issued by the

Research Department

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE CITY OF TORONTO

ISBN 0-88881-146-2 ISSN 0316-8786

MANAGERIAL ATTITUDES TOWARDS PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT

A Study of Supervisory Personnel at the Toronto Board of Education

John FitzGerald
Janis Gershman

#146

September, 1977

Project Director: E. N. Wright

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
Introduction	1
Experience with Part-time Employment	3
Length of the Work Week	4
Benefits and Disadvantages	5
Other Comments	12
Summary and Discussion of Results	13
References	16
Appendix	17

MANAGERIAL ATTITUDES TOWARDS PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT
A Study of Supervisory Personnel at the Toronto Board of Education

The benefits and disadvantages of part-time employment have been debated many times. Hallaire (1968) has provided a good summary of the arguments for and against it. As benefits claimed for it he lists:

(1) alleviation of manpower shortages;

(2) a reduction in cost compared to foreign labour (this is obviously not an important benefit in Canada, where the so-called guestworker system* is not as widespread as it is in other countries);

(3) higher productivity due to: more efficient handling of daily and weekly peak workloads; reduction of fatigue, overtime and absenteeism (Hallaire provides evidence to substantiate these claims);

(4) satisfaction of the work aspirations of married women;

(5) changes in the role of men (this means essentially that the husband works a different shift than the wife, and so has to do the household chores when he's off work; of course, although the husband's role may change, neither the husband nor the wife may be happy about the arrangement).

As arguments against part-time employment he lists:

(1) an increase in fixed management expenses, such as recruiting costs (Hallaire asserts that this argument was made to him only by companies that had no part-time staff, as increases in these expenses were inconsequential; however, many respondents in the study to be described listed increases in such costs as a disadvantage of part-time employment);

(2) problems with social insurance and welfare programs;

(3) conflict between full and part-time employees;

(4) "dilution of responsibilities" (p. 55) and problems of supervision -- Hallaire considers these to be difficult problems, and states that the question to be answered by a company considering part-time employment is whether the expected increase in efficiency is greater than the increase in indirect costs such as the cost of supervision;

(5) fear of creating unemployment among full-time workers;

(6) inadequate rates of pay;

---

* A country using the guestworker system admits foreign workers for a limited time only (usually a year).

(7) risk of preventing reduction in the working hours of full-time employees;

(8) part-time jobs are subordinate, and workers do not have the same guarantees of employment as full-time workers;

(9) depression of wages;

(10) competition with full-time employment in times of underemployment;

(11) speedup of full-time work (since part-time workers, because of their shorter hours, and lower fatigue, can set higher rates);

(12) creation of a separate category of worker.

Although a large number of objections can be made to part-time work, it appears to be attractive to some Board employees. In a study of the Board's non-teaching employees, Reich (1975) found among other things, that about one-third of those who replied to her questionnaire believed that they might like to work part-time at some time during their working years.* After studying Reich's report, the Subcommittee on Part-time Employment recommended to the Board that the Research Department should examine "reactions to part-time work by supervisory personnel of the Board" (Board Minutes, April 22, 1976, Appendix G, pp. 351-353) and the Board passed a motion asking for such an examination.

A questionnaire was designed which asked supervisory personnel to describe their experience in supervising part-time employees and to list what they believed were the benefits and disadvantages of part-time employment. A copy of the questionnaire is provided in the Appendix; the questionnaire is based in part on one used by the Women's Advisory Committee of the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Inter-governmental Affairs, Ontario (1975).

---

* Of course, saying on a questionnaire that you are interested in part-time employment does not mean that you will apply for part-time work if it becomes available. For example, even if you are very interested in part-time work, you may not be able to afford the reduction in pay. Since April 22, 1976 the Board has solicited applications from full-time employees for the conversion of their jobs to part-time and has received only 16 applications.

The questionnaire was sent out in May of 1977 to 176 supervisory personnel, all of whom were members of the Board's Schedule II. After two weeks people who had not replied received another letter reminding them of the questionnaire. Altogether, 94 replies were received.

Experience with Part-Time Employment

The first three questions asked:

(1) whether the respondents employed regular part-time staff;

(2) whether they had employed regular part-time staff in the past;

(3) whether there were any other jobs in their jurisdictions which could be done by part-time employees, if it were possible to increase the number of employees.

Answers to these questions were independent; that is, the answer to one question did not determine the answer to another question.

Twenty-four of the 94 respondents answered that they now employed regular part-time staff, 25 that they had employed regular part-time staff in the past, and 16 that there were other jobs in their jurisdictions which could be performed by regular part-time staff. Many of the supervisory personnel from the Building and Plant division reported that contracts with unions representing their employees did not allow for part-time work in skilled jobs. So, to obtain estimates based on the replies of supervisory personnel who might be able to employ part-time workers, the frequencies were calculated again for all supervisory personnel except those in the Building and Plant division. Twenty, or 38.5 per cent, of the 52 remaining respondents reported that they now employed regular part-time staff; the same number reported that they had employed regular part-time staff in the past; and 11, or 21.1 per cent, reported that there were other jobs in their jurisdiction which could be done by regular part-time employees if more employees were hired.

Does having worked with part-time staff make one more likely to feel that other jobs in one's jurisdiction could be done by part-time workers? In finding the answer to this question the replies of supervisory personnel from the Building and Plant division were again excluded from the analysis. Twenty-four respondents either had employed or were employing regular part-time staff; five of them (20.8 per cent) reported that other jobs in their jurisdiction could be done by regular part-time staff. Twenty-eight respondents had never employed regular part-time staff; six of them (21.4 per cent) reported that other jobs in their jurisdiction could be done by regular part-time staff. This difference is obviously not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = .003$).

The first three questions also asked for the numbers and categories of current part-time workers and of possible future part-time workers. However, as some respondents were subordinates of other respondents, it was impossible to tell if jobs were being reported more than once, so these data were not analyzed.

Length of the Work Week

Question 4 asked respondents to estimate the minimum number of hours that a part-time employee would have to work to "contribute effectively" to their departments. Twenty-seven of the 94 respondents replied that a part-time employee would have to work 16 to 22 hours a week -- this category, of course, includes half-time workers. Forty-one of the respondents either gave no answer or said that part-time work was impossible in their departments. The remaining replies were distributed fairly evenly among the rest of the categories. Supervisory personnel in Building and Plant were more likely than other supervisory personnel either not to answer or to say part-time work was impossible ($\chi^2 = 8.58$ with 1 df; $p < .05$), so it was

decided once again to perform a second analysis looking only at the replies of supervisory personnel who might have an opportunity to hire part-time personnel. Twenty of them, or 38.5 per cent, replied that a part-time employee would have to work 16 to 22 hours a week; the comparable percentage of the entire sample is 28.7 per cent. Sixteen, or 30.8 per cent, either gave no answer or said that part-time work was impossible; the comparable percentage of the entire sample is 43.6 per cent.

The ten-month year did not find great favour as a minimum; only eight people chose it.

Benefits and Disadvantages

Questions 5, 6 and 7 asked the respondents to list benefits and disadvantages of part-time employment, and ways to reduce the disadvantages to a minimum. Respondents were more likely to report disadvantages than benefits. For example, 57 or the 94 respondents listed no benefits of part-time work, while only eight listed no disadvantages. The difference between these frequencies is statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 56.46$ with 1 df; $p < .001$). This pattern still existed when the replies from the Building and Plant division were excluded from the analysis; twenty-three (44.2 per cent) of the remaining respondents listed no benefits, while only three (5.8 per cent) listed no disadvantages ($\chi^2 = 20.51$ with 1 df; $p < .001$).

All benefits and disadvantages reported by the respondents are included in the following lists. The exact number of times that a specific opinion was recorded is not always reported; it is irrelevant to the validity of the opinion, and reporting it may cause results to be over-interpreted. No benefit was mentioned by more than six people and no disadvantage by more than nineteen (the second most frequently reported

disadvantage was mentioned by seven people). Direct quotation of a comment indicates that it could not be rephrased in a shorter version without altering the meaning or that its meaning was not clear to the authors. If solutions for a specific problem are not discussed, none were mentioned by the respondents. Failure to comment on the shortcomings of a suggestion does not indicate that the authors believe that the suggestion is necessarily valid; in fact, the validity of none of these suggestions can be assumed without empirical investigation.

The great majority of benefits reported were ways in which part-time employment would make operations more productive and more economical. These suggested benefits included:

(1) reduction of absenteeism - there are several ways in which part-time employment could reasonably be expected to reduce absenteeism. For example, if employees in a paired position* agree to cover each other's absences, absenteeism is eliminated. Absenteeism can also be eliminated by half-time employees who make up their absences at times they normally would not work. Hallaire (1968) reported that part-time workers usually are less likely to be absent than full-time workers.

(2) the retention of trained staff who want to change to part-time work and who, if part-time work is not available at the Board, will find part-time jobs elsewhere;

(3) the creation of a staff with a greater variety of skills, along with an increased opportunity to use each employee's special skills to advantage;

(4) more efficient handling of peak workloads in jobs where workloads vary greatly and predictably during the day;

(5) more flexible scheduling of work;

(6) more economic handling of jobs in which there simply isn't enough work for a full-time employee;

(7) reduction of costs - only one of the people who made this suggestion also offered an explanation. This person suggested that part-time employment would produce a saving in fringe benefits, but this saving will come only if fringe benefits are denied to part-time workers. This would be contrary to the Board's policy on part-time employment;

(8) a greater opportunity to train employees for specific jobs;

(9) a greater understanding of Board procedures by part-time employees than by casual employees (because part-time employees have worked longer in the department);

---

* A job performed by two half-time employees instead of one full-time employee.

(10) a greater ability to attract qualified help;

(11) the completion of half-day tasks as separate work units;

(12) more time for full-time employees to work on reports for committees and for the Board;

(13) "greater job dispersal";

(14) "more concentrated service";

(15) more effective covering of holidays.

The first four of the preceding list were the most frequently reported benefits on the list.

Of the other benefits reported, the most frequently mentioned was improved morale. Reasons were not often given to account for this improvement, but improved morale could be expected as a result of some of the other benefits which have already been mentioned. For example, one might expect employees' morale to increase if the jobs they are doing are better suited to their talents. Some respondents believed that part-time work would help to reduce the monotony of routine jobs (apparently simply because part-time workers would spend fewer hours at these jobs); if this were true, it should also help to increase morale.

Some respondents suggested that part-time employment would create extra jobs, and would therefore help fight unemployment. However, this suggestion rests on some questionable assumptions (for example, that the unemployed want part-time work).

Other benefits suggested were: more free time for workers; "a rewarding diversity of approach for department and person"; the use of part-time jobs to prepare workers for retirement; the employment of 210-day clerical staff to service 210-day professional staff.

The most frequently mentioned disadvantages of part-time employment were lack of continuity* and problems created by increasing

---

* This was by far the most frequently mentioned disadvantage. Nineteen people mentioned it, while only seven mentioned the next most frequent

the number of employees. Most people who mentioned lack of continuity did not elaborate on the statement, but the problem of work taking longer to do was also mentioned (this would probably not be a disadvantage of paired or ten-month jobs). Some people reported that a disadvantage of part-time employment is that part-time workers are not always available when needed or when it is most convenient for their supervisors to consult them; many people who mentioned lack of continuity as a disadvantage may also have been implying lack of availability, which is certainly related. Only two people offered solutions to the problem of lack of continuity, and neither solution was very precise. The solutions were: "changes in procedure to ensure continuity of work," and "very specific workload allocations." As solutions to the problem of lack of availability respondents suggested that part-time employees should be on constant call, if this is possible, or simply that supervisory obtain from part-time employees permission to call them at home (the last suggestion would, of course, work only if the employee called could be at home during working hours).

If the number of part-time employees at the Board is increased, the number of employees of all types will likely increase as well. Respondents mentioned many different disadvantages due to this increase in the total number of employees. They included:

(1) more time spent recruting employees;
(2) more time spent training employees;
(3) more time spent supervising employees;
(4) higher administrative costs (in making up a longer and more complicated payroll, for example);
(5) problems in sharing equipment and space;
(6) complication of holiday schedules.

We have seen that Hallaire (1968) considered some of these problems to be very difficult. The respondents could think of few ways

to solve these problems, although one suggested that space-sharing problems could be alleviated by a staggered work schedule (meaning, probably, some type of shift), and another suggested that space-sharing problems would be easily resolved after a short while by the employees concerned.

Some respondents reported that part-time employment was simply not suitable for their departments; they offered the following reasons:

(1) the department is "crisis-oriented";

(2) the department's "uneven work flow" would cause problems in assigning work;

(3) the department's work is tied to the school time-table;

(4) the department's work is specialized, and is performed without supervision;

(5) the department's work must be done immediately and not put off to the next day;

(6) the department's need for security made "full-time, dependable employees" necessary;

(7) the department is too small; one respondent reported that only one person is in the office for most of the day;

(8) schools would be deprived of service on demand.

Some of these objections can be questioned. It is not clear why part-time employees are incapable of doing specialized or unsupervised work, being dependable, or staying in an office for an entire day. The other objections, while valid for some part-time jobs, do not apply to paired jobs.

Some people objected to part-time work because of undesirable personal characteristics they believed part-time workers possess. Part-time workers were said to lack reliability, responsibility, and commitment to their work. It is likely that these opinions are not based on objective evidence but are subjective interpretations of individual experience with a small and unrepresentative sample of part-time workers. Such subjective

interpretations may be correct, but one cannot apply them to part-time workers in general.

One solution offered to the possible problem of part-time workers' undesirable characteristics was that part-time workers be recruited more carefully than full-time workers; this suggestion is reasonable and would probably not create problems for the Board. However, it is doubtful that the Board's recruiting procedures are less successful in detecting unreliable applicants for part-time work than they are in determining unreliable applicants for full-time work. If the Board's full-time staff is reliable and responsible, and if part-time staff are recruited as carefully as full-time staff, it is likely that part-time staff will be reliable and responsible.

Another solution offered was stricter supervision of part-time employees than of full-time employees; however, this solution could cause problems when full-time and part-time employees work together. Another respondent suggested that part-time workers could be given more commitment to their work by being given bonuses and "favoured status" for future permanent jobs. However, favours for part-time employees might not be viewed with equanimity by full-time employees (Hallaire, 1968, discusses some examples of problems arising where part-time employees had easier work schedules than full-time employees). One respondent suggested that part-time employees would be responsible if they were given some responsibility. The only other suggestion was to hire only full-time employees.

The only other disadvantage to be reported frequently was that part-time employment was contrary to the collective agreement with the department's employees. The only solution offered was to renegotiate the contracts; however, as the relevant provisions of the contract are intended to guarantee a full week's work for all employees, it may not

be too easy to renegotiate the contract. Very precise specifications of the conditions under which part-time employment is to be permitted would certainly be required.

The preceding disadvantages were the only ones reported by more than one person; the following is a list of the other disadvantages reported, with proposed solutions in parentheses following the statement of the disadvantage:

(1) part-time employment may lead to high turnover* (keep jobs interesting);

(2) part-time employees cost more than casual help from an agency (hire casual help from an agency);

(3) part-time workers are "peripheral to innovative thrusts" in a department;

(4) "With staff establishment at a minimum, serious situations are encountered when illness strikes and holiday periods are taken.";

(5) "duplication of time at staff meetings";

(6) inadequate pensions;

(7) poor benefits (provide better benefits);

(8) increased benefit costs (have half the employees working more than half-time and half less so that fewer benefits are payable);

(9) "possible loss of availability on sudden increase of workload";

(10) "may create problems during peak work periods" (flexible scheduling);

(11) "it would be more difficult to provide service on demand for schools";

(12) "dilution of responsibility";

(13) extra time would be required for staff to go to staff and professional development meetings;

(14) "available help not efficient enough for demands of work";

(15) more conflict between employees (careful pairing of employees);

(16) "occasional deadline crises";

---

* This objection is supported by Reich's finding that most non-teaching employees are interested in part-time work of short duration (1 to 5 years).

(17) morale may drop if experienced part-time workers do better work than full time employees (don't let part-timers do supervisory work);

(18) lack of communication between people doing the same job;

(19) part-time employees are unlikely to acquire necessary technical knowledge;

(20) it is difficult to hire a specialist for part-time work (hire retired people);

(21) startup and shutdown costs would increase;

(22) part-time workers would not know enough about day-to-day operations.

The validity of some of these suggestions is questionable, and many of the others would require further investigation before their validity could be assessed, but most appear to raise important questions for consideration.

Other Comments

The last section of the questionnaire asked for other comments about part-time employment. Most of these were further statements of advantages and disadvantages, and have been included in the analysis of advantages and disadvantages. However, some of the comments pointed out very well the limitations of the questionnaire. For example, one respondent wrote: "I can't see this sytem being much help in our department. If you had a plan to present for consideration I would be glad to study it." The questionnaire did not present any plans for increasing the number of part-time positions, nor did it ask for comments about different types of part-time employment. Most of the respondents had not had extensive experience with part-time workers, and it was found, for example, that in listing disadvantages of part-time employment some of them had probably not considered all the different types of part-time employment. Another respondent stated: "My answers reflect my personal

opinions, not a study of the matter." The questionnaire did not reflect a study of part-time employment, and did not make respondents aware of the niceties of the issue.

Summary and Discussion of Results

Most supervisory personnel at the Board have never employed part-time staff and do not believe that more part-time jobs could be created in their departments. Respondents who had at any time employed part-time staff were not more likely than the other respondents to believe that part-time jobs could be created in their departments.

Respondents preferred to hire part-time employees who would work at least 16 hours a week. Reich (1975) found that most employees who wanted to work part-time wanted to work at least 15 hours a week; one problem, though, is that 43% of the men wanted full-time for part of the year rather than part-time all year (only 18% of the women stated a similar preference).

Most of the reported benefits of part-time employment were ways in which the operating efficiency of the Board could be increased. Benefits of part-time employment for society in general (such as reduction of unemployment) were rarely mentioned, and no one reported as benefits ways in which part-time employment would be especially beneficial to women. The most frequently reported benefits were: improvement of morale; reduced absenteeism; the retention of trained staff who want to work part-time;* the creation of a staff with a greater variety of skills; increased opportunity to use each employee's special skills to advantage; more efficient handling of peak workloads in jobs where workloads vary greatly and predictably throughout the day. Respondents did not mention

---

* Reich's findings (1975) certainly support this argument.

that overtime would be reduced, but this is probably implied by the last advantage in the preceding list. It should be noted, however, that very few people reported that part-time employment would be beneficial because part-time workers could be paid lower wages and would receive fewer fringe benefits than full-time employees, and that as many people reported that such practices would be undesirable.

In general, supervisory personnel were more likely to believe that part-time employment would be disadvantageous than beneficial. The most frequently reported disadvantages were ways in which part-time employment would reduce the Board's operating efficiency. Perhaps the most persuasive of the arguments offered to support the belief that part-time employment would be disadvantageous was that it would increase costs by increasing the time necessary for recruiting, training, and supervision, and by increasing the amount of administrative paper work necessary to deal with a larger staff. Although Hallaire (1968) rejects some of these arguments, his reasons for doing so appear weak. Related arguments were that part-time employment would lead to lack of continuity in the completion of work, and that part-time workers would not always be available when they were needed; these also may be important problems. Another serious problem is that in many departments contracts with employees do not permit part-time work.

Whether or not the disadvantages of part-time work outweigh the benefits is a question which cannot be decided by the present study. One reason is that the respondents were not asked to comment on any detailed plan for encouraging part-time employment, or on different types of part-time work. Respondents sometimes seemed to be unaware of all the types of part-time employment, since some of the disadvantages they reported did not apply to all types. Because of these limitations of the questionnaire,

respondents' comments were most likely based on their own individual and different conceptions of part-time work. Respondents also were not asked to comment on different consequences of part-time employment, such as possible social benefits and usually talked only of its effects on the Board's costs and on productivity. Finally, the present study cannot fully assess the relative importance of the disadvantages and benefits of part-time employment because it looks only at opinions, not at objective measures of disadvantages and benefits.

To decide whether or not the Board should encourage part-time employment requires a cost-benefit analysis of a pilot project. However, even if it were possible to undertake a cost-benefit analysis for the Toronto Board, non-financial social benefits would still have to be considered in making a decision.

If a change in the present program of providing for and encouraging part-time is ever considered, a clearly defined plan should be drawn up. This plan could then be evaluated and supervisory staff could comment on it. Supervisory staff have to be assured that they will have enough employees if positions in their departments are converted to part-time. Employees have to know what their future opportunities will be if they take a part-time position; for example, will they be able to return to working full-time in the same job?

Further research on encouraging part-time employment at the Board should not be performed until such a plan has been drawn up and until supervisory and non-supervisory staff have had an opportunity to comment on it.

REFERENCES

Hallaire, J. Part-time employment. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1968.

Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Inter-Governmental Affairs (Ontario). Survey of attitudes towards permanent part-time work. Toronto: Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Inter-Governmental Affairs, 1975.

Reich, C. The effects of a teacher's sex on career development. Toronto: The Board of Education for the City of Toronto, Research Department, 1975 (#131).

APPENDIX

NAME: _____

POSITION: _____

QUESTIONNAIRE ON PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT

The following definition of "part-time" will be used:

> "regular work carried out by persons included in the Establishment during working hours distinctly shorter than normal."

It is understood that working on a part-time basis would be an employee's choice; no person would be obligated to work part-time.

Please exclude students and similar occasional help which are not part of your Establishment. Positions which have been converted to a 10-month year should be considered as part-time.

(1) Do you now employ any regular part-time staff? Yes _____ No _____

If yes, describe position(s) and the part-time schedule.

_____

_____

(2) Have you employed regular part-time staff in the past? Yes _____ No _____

If yes, describe position(s) and the part-time schedule.

_____

_____

(3) Are there jobs under your jurisdiction, other than those listed above, which could be done on a regular part-time basis if there were more people (e.g., 5 people working 21 hrs./wk. instead of 3 people working 35 hrs./wk.)? Yes _____ No _____

If yes,

(a) How many people do you have in your Establishment?

_____

(b) How many positions and what types of jobs could be done on a part-time basis by more people, e.g, 1 supervisory, 1 professional, 2 clerical, etc.? _____

_____

_____

(4) What is the minimum number of hours a regular part-time employee would have to work in order to contribute effectively to your department:

No Minimum _____

10-16 hrs./wk. _____

16-22 hrs./wk. (includes 1/2 time, e.g., mornings only, etc.) _____

23-29 hrs./wk. _____

10 month year _____

full-time but not full year (other than 10 month year) _____

other _____

(5) What are the possible benefits arising from the use of regular part-time employees in your department? _____

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

(6) What are the possible disadvantages arising from the use of regular part-time employees in your department? _____

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

(7) What are possible ways to minimize the disadvantages? _____

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

(8) Other Comments: _____